



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,741	01/14/2004	Stephen Ray Cole	149-0168US	4875
29855 7590 06/19/2007 WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH, RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, L.L.P. 20333 SH 249 SUITE 600 HOUSTON, TX 77070			EXAMINER LY, CHEYNE D	
			ART UNIT 2168	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/19/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/757,741

Applicant(s)

COLE ET AL.

Examiner

Cheyne D. Ly

Art Unit

2168

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-72 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>dictionary.com (pages 1-2)</u> |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-72 are examined on the merits.
2. NON-FINAL.

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

1. The USC 35, 112, Second Paragraph, rejection has been withdrawn; therefore, Applicant's argument is moot.
2. In regard to Applicant's argument (pages 14-15) directed to the new limitation of "unloading only the identified row...", Applicant's argument is not persuasive because Sockut discloses the argued new limitation. For example, the below cite portion of Sockut discloses "we find...an overflow record...Unloading an overflow..." (page 11, lines 1-10). The limitation of "only" has been attributed with the customary and ordinary meaning of "being the single one or relatively few of the kind" (dictionary.com). Further, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily attributed the record of Sockut to the claimed row as supported by Ramakrishnan (page 22, last paragraph, especially, "tuples, also called records...each tuple is a row). Therefore, the disclosure cited disclosure Sockut reasonably anticipates the argued limitation. It is noted that the citation of the above secondary references has been necessitated by the claim amendment.
3. In regard to the arguments directed to the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections, Applicant's argument is disclosure by Socku which has been deemed to be unpersuasive as discussed above.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. **Claims 1-6, 14-20, 27-30, 39-48, 55-60, and 69-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sockut (1997).**

CLAIM INTERPRETATIONS

6. Sockut discloses the described method has been implemented in the IBM's DATABASE 2 (DB2*) as described by References 13 and 14 (page 2, lines 1-6). Therefore, the inclusion of Reference 13 Haderle et al. (Haderle hereafter) has been provided to describe the inherent features of said DB2*.

PRIOR ART

7. In regard to claim 1, Sockut discloses an overflow row repair method, comprising:
- Retrieving a page of memory associated with a source table (page 4, paragraph 7, especially, "the table space or partition on which reorganization operates", and page 11, lines 1-39, especially, "scanning the file pages...");
- Interrogating the page of memory to identify an overflow row (page 11, lines 1-39, especially, "we find a...overflow record");
- Unloading only the identified overflow row from the source table (page 11, lines 1-39, especially, "we find...an overflow record...Unloading an overflow...");

Deleting the identified overflow row from the source table (page 1, Abstract etc., and page 4, 6th paragraph, especially, “removes overflow...”, and pages 9-10, Table 2); and Loading the previously unloaded identified overflow row into the source table (page 11, lines 1-39, especially, “Reloading of data....”).

8. In regard to claims 2 and 3, Sockut discloses retrieving and interrogating are repeated for each page of memory comprising the source table (pages 5-6, especially, “execute iteratively...”, and page 15, Control of iterations (step 3) section).
9. In regard to claim 4, Sockut discloses the source table further comprises an index (page 3, 4th paragraph, especially, “Storage structures for indexes...”)
10. In regard to claim 5, Sockut discloses the act of retrieving comprises retrieving the page of memory from a buffer pool (page 4, last paragraph, especially, “storage buffers...”).
11. In regard to claim 6, Sockut discloses the act of retrieving comprising retrieving the page of memory from a direct access storage device (Haderle et al., page 112, column 2, line 9, especially, “Direct Access Storage Devices...”).
12. In regard to claims 14-16, Sockut discloses the DELETE, and INSERT statements (pages 9-10, Table 2). Further, Haderle describes the executing of SELECT statement for retrieving data (page 113, column 2, lines 4-24).
13. In regard to claims 17-20, 27, 43-48, and 55-57, Sockut discloses the claimed invention as cited above.
14. In regard to claims 28-30, 39-42, 58-60, and 69-72, Sockut discloses the claimed invention as cited above. Further, Sockut discloses the non-source table data source comprises a database log file (page 5 in its entirety, especially, “log entries...”) and a

plurality of identified overflow rows at a time (page 13, last two paragraphs, especially, "over flow records...").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

17. Claims 7, 21, 31, 32, 49, 61, and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sockut (1997) as applied to claims 1-6, 14-20, 27-30, 39-48, 55-60, and 69-72 above.

18. In regard to claims 7, 21, 31, 49, and 61, Sockut describes alternatives to reorganization by using page level locks and hold them until commitment to avoid the complexity (page 19, 6th paragraph). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention have been motivated by the described alternatives to reorganization to lock the source

table before deleting to avoid the complexity. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method described by Sockut by locking the source table before deleting to avoid the complexity.

19. In regard to claims 32 and 62, Sockut describes unlocking the source table after the act of reloading the identified overflow row (page 8, lines 5-11, especially, “our technique requires no lock while reloading...”). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the method described by Sockut by unlocking the source table to avoid the complexity.

- 20. Claims 8, 9, 11, 12, 22, 24-26, 33, 34, 37, 38, 50, 51, 53, 54, 63, 64, 67, and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sockut (1997) above, and further in view of Jenkins, Jr. (US 5,899,993 A) (Jenkins hereafter).**

MOTIVATION TO COMBINE

21. Jenkins describes a “significant disadvantage of the prior art constraint enablement techniques is that inserts, updates, and deletes...If the existing body of data is large, validating a constraint may take hours...One attempt to avoid the delay...allows users to specify constraints that are only enforced” (column 2, line 66, to column 3, line 6). While, Sockut describes an improvement to the well known in the art reorganization method which takes a longer time than the users can afford to have the database unavailable (page 1, second to the last paragraph). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated Jenkins to improve the method described by Sockut to avoid delays.

PRIOR ART

22. In regard to claims 8, 22, 33, 50, and 63, Sockut describes all the limitations of said claims except for the limitation of “identifying a constraint...” and “disabling the identified constraint...” Jenkins describes “identifying a constraint...” and “disabling the identified constraint...” (column 3, lines 7-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the method of Sockut with the constraints described by Jenkins to avoid delays.

23. In regard to claims 9, 24, 31, 34, 51, and 64, Sockut discloses the described method has been implemented in the IBM's DATABASE 2 (DB2*) as described by References 13 and 14 (page 2, lines 1-6). Haderle which has been cited to describe that DB2 is well known in the art to have a lock management system (Haderle, page 120, column 2, last paragraph). Further, Applicant's specification (page 3 and Figure 1) discloses that it is well known in the art that DB2 locks the source table during the reorganization. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the method of Sockut with the constraints described by Jenkins to avoid delays.

24. In regard to claims 11, 12, 25, 26, 37, 38, 53, 54, 67, and 68, due to the vague and indefinite issue directed to said claims, the claimed invention has been interpreted reasonably broad for the prior art rejection. Sockut and Jenkins render the claimed invention obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as cited above.

25. Claims 10, 23, 36, 52, and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sockut (1997) and Jenkins, Jr. (US 5,899,993 A) (Jenkins hereafter) above in further view of Wu et al. (2005/0080979).

MOTIVATION TO COMBINE

26. Wu describes an improvement to the IBM DB2 computer database software to maximize resource allocations (page 1, [0009] to [0011]) to reduce costly disk I/O time (page 2, column 1, lines 5-8). Sockut discloses the described method has been implemented in the IBM's DATABASE 2 (DB2*) as described by References 13 and 14 (page 2, lines 1-6). Jenkins describes a "significant disadvantage of the prior art constraint enablement techniques is that inserts, updates, and deletes...If the existing body of data is large, validating a constraint may take hours...One attempt to avoid the delay...allows users to specify constraints that are only enforced" (column 2, line 66, to column 3, line 6). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated by Wu to improve the method described by Sockut and Jenkins to avoid delays by reducing costly disk I/O time.

PRIOR ART

27. In regard to claims 10, 23, 36, 52, and 66, Sockut in view of Jenkins describes the limitations of said claims, except for the limitation of "dropping the identified constraint" or "deleting the identified constraint." Wu describes the limitations of "dropping the identified constraint" and "deleting the identified constraint" (page 3, [0042], especially, "to delete a constraint from the working set"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2168

one of ordinary skill in the art to use the method described by Sockut and Jenkins to avoid delays by reducing costly disk I/O time as described by Wu.

28. Claims 13, 35, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sockut and Jenkins, Jr. (US 5,899,993 A) (Jenkins hereafter) above in further view of Jacobs et al. (US 6047285 A) (Jacobs hereafter).

MOTIVATION TO COMBINE

29. Jenkins describes a “significant disadvantage of the prior art constraint enablement techniques is that inserts, updates, and deletes...If the existing body of data is large, validating a constraint may take hours...One attempt to avoid the delay...allows users to specify constraints that are only enforced” (column 2, line 66, to column 3, line 6). Sockut describes an improvement to known in the art reorganization method which takes a longer time than the users can afford to have the database unavailable (page 1, second to the last paragraph). While, Jacobs describe an improvement for resource allocations using the described improved constraints (column 6, lines 10-41). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated Jenkins to improve the method of Sockut with the constraint enforcement described by Jacobs to avoid delays.

PRIOR ART

30. In regard to claims 13, 35, and 65, Sockut and Jenkins describe the limitations of said claims as described above, except for the limitation of “deferred constraint.” Jacobs describes the limitation “deferred constraint” (column 7, line 50, to column 8, line 19). It

is noted that Jacobs is not explicit in regard to the limitation of “the identified constraint is not locked.” However, the deferred constraint of Jacobs fits the requirement for the “the identified constraint” to be not locked. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to use the method described by Jenkins and Sockut with the constraint enforcement described by Jacobs to avoid delays.

CONCLUSION


31. Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.
32. For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199. The USPTO's official fax number is 571-272-8300.

Art Unit: 2168

33. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Dune Ly, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0716.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.

34. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo, can be reached on (571) 272-3642.

C. Dune Ly 
Patent Examiner
6/8/07